

R E M A R K S

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Restriction Requirement of February 22, 2007, in which claims 1-29 are pending and subject to a restriction/election. Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Applicant elects Species 1 corresponding to Figure 2; claims 1-4, 8-17, 19 and 22-26 are readable thereon.

Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement as improperly made. For a restriction requirement to be proper there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required. MPEP 803 says that "if the search and examination of all the claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examiner them on the merits, even though they include claims to independent or distinct inventions. Applicant suspects that the claims currently withdrawn by Applicant in conformity with this requirement would fall into the same classification as those claims currently elected. To say that all the claims would fall into the same classification is, of course, not an admission that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, for it is quite common for patentably distinct inventions to be classified in the same field of search. Nevertheless, as the Examiner has not shown that the search and examination of all the claims in this application cannot be made without serious burden, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the restriction requirement.

Examination of the above-identified claims is respectfully requested. If a phone conference is believed necessary to resolve any outstanding issues with respect to the above discussion, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Eskuri

By his Attorney,



David M. Crompton, Reg. No. 36,772
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 800
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403-2420
Tel: (612) 677-9050 Fax: (612) 359-9349

Dated: 3/28/07